



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,797	06/29/2001	John Trezza	4024-4008	8282
27123	7590	01/24/2006	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			BELLO, AGUSTIN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2633	

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/896,797

Applicant(s)

TREZZA, JOHN

Examiner

Agustin Bello

Art Unit

2633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 October 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-55 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/21/05.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doerr (U.S. Patent No. 5,909,294) in view of Deacon (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,641).

Regarding claims 1, 13, 14, 26, 27, 42, and 52, Doerr teaches multiple optical devices (reference numeral 102 in Figure 1) being of a common device type, at least two of the multiple optical devices sharing a common contact defining a group (reference numeral 101 in Figure 1), each of the at least two of the multiple optical devices in the group being individually selectable relative to others in the group (e.g. via switch 104 in Figure 1), and a controller (reference numeral 104 in Figure 1), coupled to the multiple optical devices. Doerr differs from the claimed invention in that Doerr fails to specifically teach that the controller can select which of the at least two optical devices in the group will be active at a given time. However, Deacon in the same field of optical devices, teaches a controller that can select which of at least two optical devices in a group of devices will be active for a given time (Figure 17). One skilled in the art would have been motivated to follow the disclosure of Deacon in the device of Doerr in order to select the amount of time that Doerr's device acted as a transmitter and the amount of time the device of Doerr acted as a receiver and to provide redundancy in the event of a fault.

Furthermore, Doerr discloses a controller for the switches, thereby suggesting the ability to select

Art Unit: 2633

which of the two optical devices is active. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include a controller as taught by Deacon in the device of Doerr which can select which of the at least two optical devices in the group will be active at a given time.

Regarding claims 2, 15, 28 Doerr further discloses that the at least two of the multiple optical devices comprise lasers (reference numeral 401 in Figure 4; column 4 lines 40-67).

Regarding claims 3, 4, 16, and 17, Doerr teaches that the lasers comprise top emitting lasers and bottom emitting lasers (reference numeral 401 in Figure 4A, column 2 lines 53-64, column 4 lines 40-56).

Regarding claims 5, 6, 18, 19, Doerr teaches that the lasers comprise distributed Bragg reflector lasers (column 4 line 40 – column 6 line 19).

Regarding claims 7, 20, 29, Doerr teaches that the at least two of the multiple optical devices comprise photodetectors (as seen in Figures 1 and 4).

Regarding claims 8, 9, 21, 22, Doerr teaches that the photodetectors comprise top and bottom receiving photodetectors (reference numeral 403 in Figure 4A; column 2 lines 53-64, column 4 lines 40-56).

Regarding claim 10 and 23, Doerr teaches that the multiple optical devices comprise lasers and photodetectors (as seen in Figures 1 and 4).

Regarding claims 11 and 24, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches memory configured to store activation information for the at least two optical devices (Figure 5a, column 10 lines 25-50 of Deacon).

Art Unit: 2633

Regarding claims 12 and 25, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches redundancy selection circuitry (reference numeral 207 in Figure 2 of Deacon).

Regarding claims 30 and 31, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches that the common connection is a substrate (reference numbers 202, 210 in Figure 2 of Deacon).

Regarding claim 33, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches a method for creating an optical chip having redundant devices for use in an optical electronic unit comprising growing active portions of multiple optical devices on a wafer using a semiconductor material, processing the wafer to create complete optical devices, patterning the semiconductor material to create individual optical devices, grouping the devices by forming grouping trenches in the wafer around sets of at least two of the individual devices', and connecting each of the at least two devices to a control circuit such that, common data can be received by any of the at least two devices but the common data will only be handled by a device of the at least two devices in the group that is an active device (specification of Deacon).

Regarding claim 34, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches storing data that identifies the device that is the active device (reference numeral 207 in Figure 2 of Deacon).

Regarding claim 35-36, 38, and 40, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches further teaches identifying which of the multiple optical devices is a backup for a failed optical device; deactivating the failed optical device; and activating the backup optical device (see abstract of Deacon).

Regarding claim 37, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches accessing data in a memory (reference numeral 207 in Figure 2 in Deacon)

Art Unit: 2633

Regarding claims 32, 39, and 41, the combination of Doerr and Deacon teaches a fusible fiber link (reference numeral 214, 216, 218 in Figure 2 of Deacon) .

Regarding claims 43-51, the Doerr and Deacon differs from the claimed invention in that Deacon fails to specifically teach the specific number of transmitters and receivers claimed. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the specific number of transmitters and receivers claimed, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Combination of.*, 193 USPQ 8 Furthermore, the number of transmitters and receivers in the transceiver is matter of design choice.

Regarding claim 53, the combination of references and Deacon in particular teaches a programmable laser selection control (reference numeral 206, 207 in Figure 2).

Regarding claim 54 and 55, the combination of references and Deacon in particular further teaches a identifying which of the multiple optical devices is a backup for a failed optical device; deactivating the failed optical device; and activating the backup optical device (see abstract).

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Agustin Bello whose telephone number is (571) 272-3026. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on (571)272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2633

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AB


AGUSTIN BELLO
PRIMARY EXAMINER